carefully investigate these schemes and decide whether they should continue to incur loss. In the present circumstances, however, it is very difficult to consider new schemes.

Mr. G. RAMIAH.—Are there not instances of schemes which were unremunerative in the initial stages and yielding decent revenues after a few years?

Sir HAROLD N. COLAM.—I am now investigating all these cases. So far as I have seen, most of the schemes are unremunerative.

Mr. G. RAMIAH.—The Assistant Superintendent has recently inspected the area and is of opinion that the schemes will be fully remunerative and that the statistics collected on a previous occasion were not accurate. Will the Government sanction the Koratagere-Madhugiri-Sira Scheme at least now?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—As the price of electrical materials has gone up considerably, due to war conditions, such schemes will have to be put off, however much the Government may be anxious to supply power to the interior parts of the State.

**Compounding of Offences relating to Goats and Galnut in Kunigal Stud Farm Area.**

*Q.*—18. Mr. T. ABDUL NABHIKHAN (Tumkur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the amount realised from 1935 to 1940 in the Kunigal Taluk by compounding of offences relating to goats and galnut (ಅಳಲೆಕಾಯಿ);

(*b*) (i) whether it is true that on 7th December 1939 the Forester and Ranger removed the galnuts collected on "Ellare bande" near Santhemavathur by Mr. Bhavikattee Sadasivaiah of Tumkur who is the contractor of minor forest produce (ಪಸಾರೆ); (ii) whether the Kunigal Stud Farm was not included within the privileges sold to Mr. Sadasivaiah for the year 1939-40; while this is so, whether the said Stud Farm was not given over to the Military Department without asking him?

*A.*—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda).—

| (*a*) *Year* | *Goats* | | | *Galnuts* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rs. | a. | p. | Rs | a. | p. |
| 1935-36 | 377 | 12 | 0 | ... | | |
| 1936-37 | 183 | 0 | 0 | ... | | |
| 1937-38 | 124 | 0 | 0 | ... | | |
| 1938-39 | 210 | 0 | 0 | ... | | |
| 1939-40* | 154 | 8 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 0 |

* Up to end of April 1940.

(*b*) (i) The galnut collected by the person who was acting as the agent of the contractor was seized and kept under departmental watch.

(ii) It is true that Kunigal Stud Farm was also included in the area leased out, but it was subsequently excluded. the Superintendent of the Farm being permitted to sell the produce in the Farm lands.

Mr. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR.—Was the contractor given notice before the galnut stored by him was attached?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—No such notice was called for. He was in arrears and so the stock was attached.

Mr. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR.—Why was the Kunigal Stud Farm which was included in the area leased out to him subsequently excluded?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—On account of administrative inconvenience, it was thought desirable to exclude this area from the lease.

Mr. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR.—Whatever the reason for such exclusion, did it not mean loss to the contractor?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—I have already given the reason. The contractor has been given a rebate of Rs. 175.

Mr. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR.—Should not the entire amount realised by the authorities from the sale of the usufruct in the Stud Farm area be given away to the contractor?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The entire amount was less than Rs. 175.

Mr. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR.—Only in one year, it was less. During the other two years it was more.

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—Government have paid reasonable compensation to the contractor for all the years.